SDNY PRO SE OFFICE

## MEMO ENDORSED

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 4 AM 10: 26

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK (SDNY).

VIKRAM DATTA PETITIONER.

DOCUMENT ELECTRONICALLY FILED DOC#: DATE FILED: 0-5-2

V.

Case# 1:11-MJ-108; 1:11-CR-0102; 1:11-CR-0102-1 (LAK); 14-cv-8653(LAK): 1:20-cv-02330-LAK.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA RESPONDENT.

SECTION 5 U.S.C. 552 (a) MOTION TO CLARIFY AND PROVIDE THE HARD COPY OF THE COUNTS/INDICTMENT WITH CASE NUMBER IN WHICH IMPRISONMENT AND FORFEITURE ORDERS WERE IMPOSED IN SENTENCING ON VIKRAM DATTA ON 1/20/2012.

## TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

COMES NOW, I, VIKRAM DATTA, prose, hereafter 'PETITIONER' moves the Honorable Court with this 'Section 5 U.S.C 552(a) Motion To Clarify and provide the hard copy of the Counts/Indictment with Case Number in which Imprisonment, and Forfeiture Orders were Imposed in Sentencing on Vikram Datta on 1/20/2012. Petitioner does not know in which counts/indictments from which case number, the Imprisonment and Forfeiture orders for \$40,000,000 in Count One, and \$29,505,265 in Counts Two and Three were imposed on to him. Petitioner respectfully states following in support:

## **PRELIMINARY STATEMENT**

Petitioner respectfully requests the Honorable Court to construe prose pleadings of petitioner liberally. Please see Harris v. Mills, 572 F.3d 66, 72 (2d Cir. 2009), Walker v. Schultz, 727 F. 3d 119 (2<sup>nd</sup> Cr. 2013), Estelle v. Gamble 429 US 97, 98 (1976), and interpret them to raise the "strongest [claims] Az Huis Court world on BISIZI, defendant was respect to the

son lable docerne